

09/733,348

SCHNEIDER

REMARKS

Examiner provides no explanation of U.S.C. §102 rejection other than listing prior art references for each step of a claim. Applicant kindly asks Examiner to provide rationale, comment, context, or explanation of how such selected references teach such steps so that the Applicant does not have to speculate or guess Examiner's reasoning. Applicant is not a mind reader.

I. Conditional Request For Constructive Assistance

If, for any reason the claims of this application are not believed to be in full condition for allowance, applicant respectfully requests the constructive assistance and suggestions of the Examiner in drafting one or more acceptable claims pursuant to MPEP §707.07(j) in order that this application can be placed in allowable condition as soon as possible and without need for further proceedings.

II. Rejection of Claim 21 Under 35 U.S.C. §101

In Paragraph 2 of the Office Action, the Examiner has rejected claim 21 under 35 USC 101 "because the claimed invention is directed to non-statutory subject matter." The Examiner does not describe how the claimed invention fails to meet the two conditions set forth in Paragraph 2 of the Office Action, so the basis for this rejection is unclear to Applicant. Nonetheless, Applicant presents herewith two new independent claims 41 and 46, both of which present an invention within the technological arts that produce a "useful, concrete and tangible result." For example, claim 41 presents a mail piece with three markings. One marking assists the sender in locating current contact information for the recipient. Claim 46 sets forth a method including a step for adding such useful information to undeliverable postal mail, thereby achieving a transformation of information allowing the postal mail to serve new use to the sender.

III. Rejection of Claims 21-29 Under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable over Uhl

Claims 21-29 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(e) as being unpatentable by Uhl (U.S. Patent 6,292,709). Applicant respectfully requests reconsideration of this rejection for at least the following reasons.

Applicant agrees with Examiner that Uhl reads on the first two steps of independent Claim 21.

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

09/733,348

SCHNEIDER

Applicant teaches generating information that assists the sender only. However Uhl in no way teaches generating information that assists the sender.

Unlike Uhl, Applicant does not teach assisting the postal carrier in any way but rather

PAGE 6/7 * RCVD AT 8/3/2005 1:05:17 PM [Eastern Daylight Time] * SVR:USPTO-EFXRF-6/30 * DNIS:2738300 * CSID:Fax * DURATION (mm-ss):03-28

BEST AVAILABLE COPY

09/733,348

SCHNEIDER

IV. Notice of References Cited, PTO-892


Applicant has carefully reviewed the references cited but not applied. Applicant respectfully submits that none of those references, alone or in any combination, remedy the deficiencies of the applied art, nor teach or suggest the claimed invention alone or in any combination.

V. Conclusion

For all of the above reasons, the present application and pending claims 41-56, as amended, are believed to be in condition for allowance. Applicant respectfully requests the Examiner to issue a formal Notice of Allowance directed to claims 41-56, inclusive.

Should the Examiner believe that a telephone interview would be helpful to expedite favorable prosecution, the Examiner is invited to contact the Applicant at the telephone number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,



August 3, 2005

Eric Schneider

pro se Applicant

13938A Cedar Road #258

University Heights, Ohio 44118

(216) 231-2400 - telephone